# Environmental Protection Agency

117 W. Main Street Collinsville, IL. 62234

July 23, 1

CERTIFIED MAIL

Refer to: LPC 16304538 - St. Clair County - East St. Louis/Wastex Research #2, Inc.

ILD 980700744

Compliance Inquiry Letter

Wastex Research, Inc. 2000 Broadway East St. Louis, Illinois 62205 Attention: James Markle

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5

Dear Mr. Markle:

Your hazardous waste management facility located in East St. Louis, Illinois was inspected on July 12, 1864, by Maryo bilday and Perry Mann. representing this Agency, in order to determine compliance with respect to Title 35: Illinois Administrative Code, Subtitle C, Support F: Ground Water Monitoring. The inspection disclosed the following apparent violations of rules and regulations.

#### Class I

725.196 (all parts therein) - Failure to implement a ground water monitoring program capable of determining the facility's impact on the quality of ground water in the uppermost aquifer underlying the facility.

725.191 (all parts therein) - Failure to implement a ground water monitoring system.

725.192 (all parts therein) - Failure to implement a sampling analysis plan with respect to the ground water monitoring system.

725.195 (all parts therein) - Failure to prepare an outline of a ground water quality assessment program.

723.154 (all parts therein) - failure to implement a record keeping and reporting plan with respect to the ground water monitoring program.

Please submit in writing, within ten (10) calendar days of this letter date, the reasons for the apparent visiations outlined above, as well as a description of the steps you have instituted to prevent any further recurrence of the apparent violations cited from the subject inspection. The written response should be sent to the address of this office, given above.

The second second

Further, take makes the compliance with the Illinois Environmental Protection Act on Automatations adopted thereunder may result in enforcement action pursuant of Parts IIII of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act, Ch. 111 1/2, III. Nev. Stat., Sec. 1001 et. seq.

Sincerely,

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Kenneth G. Mensing, Southern Regional Manager

Field Operations Section

Division of Land Pollution Control

Enclosures: Subpart F Inspection Report

Subtitle G Regulations

#### HRD/cas

cc: Division File cc: Southern Region cc: Hark Haney cc: Phil Van Ness cc: Bob Kuykendall

#### APPENDIX A-1

# FACILITY INSPECTION FORM FOR COMPLIANCE WITH INTERIM STATUS STANDARDS COVERING GROUNDWATER MONITORING

General Int	formation
-------------	-----------

USEPA Number: <u>ILD 9807007</u>	<u>44</u> IEPA Number: <u>1630450038</u>
	G/T/TSO Regulated As: G/T/TSD
Facility Name: <u>EAST ST. Louis</u>	/ WASTEX RESEARCH
Street: 2000 BROADWAY	
City: EAST ST. Louis	State: TUINDIS Zip Code: 62205
Phone: /618) 271 - 2372	County: ST. CLAIR
Facility Contact Official: Joe Burrough	Branch/Organization: WASTEY RESEARCH
Title: Chief Engineer	
	185 Time: (From) 10:00 (To) 11:30 am
	F/U / / (Date of Initial Inspection)
Preparer Information:	Section Class Class
Name:	
Charles Reeter	725.190, 725.191, 2 725.192, 725.193, 2
Agency/Title: Epc TII	725.194
Agency/Title: EPS TIL  IEPA / Gwm Coordinator	
Telephone:	
(618)345-4606	TOTAL Class I's & II's 5
	YES NO UNKNOWN WAVIED
Type of facility: (check appropriately)	*
a) surface impoundment b) landfill	<del></del>
<ul><li>c) land treatment facility</li><li>d) disposal waste pile*</li></ul>	
Groundwater Monitoring Program	* In litination
1. Was the groundwater monitoring program	IN Visigarian
reviewed prior to site visit? if "NO",	Alacco val vala
a) Was the groundwater program reviewed at the facility prior to site inspection?	No groundwater program available
2. Has a groundwater monitoring program (capable of determining the facility's impact on the quality of groundwater in the uppermost aquifer underlying the facility) been implemented? 725.190(a)	

\*Listed separate from landfill for convenience of identification.

# ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

DATE:

July 23, 1984

TO:

Division File

FROM:

Margo R. Dilday - Southern Region MRD

SUBJECT:

LPC 16304538 - St. Clair County - East St. Louis/Wastex #2 ILD 980700744 - Subpart F Inspection conducted July 12, 1984

This memorandum serves to highlight and clarify items within the checklist to better indicate alleged violations and point out deficiencies, which by a strict interpretation of 725.190-194, the latter cannot be considered violations, but nevertheless cause the ground water monitoring program to be inadequate relative to the information described to be desirable in the guidelines, Groundwater Monitoring Guidance of Owners and Operators of Interim Status Facilities, USEPA; SW-963: Revised March 1983.

Perry Mann and this writer visited the subject facility on July 12, 1984 to determine compliance with the Subpart F Ground Water Monitoring requirements. Joe Burroughs and Alvin Markle accompanied us during the on-site inspection.

#### Appendix A-1

No ground water monitoring program has been proposed or implemented at Wastex #2. No monitoring wells existed and no geohydrologic investigation was under way.

### Appendix A-2

Not applicable as of the 7/12/84 inspection date.

# Appendix A-3

Not applicable as of the 7/12/84 inspection date.

### Appendix B

See Appendix A-1 above.

# Appendix C

Not applicable as of the 7/12/84 inspection date.

# Appendix D

Not applicable as of the 7/12/84 inspection date.

RECEIVED

JUL 24 1034

ELMA - ULL P.C. STATE OF ILLINOPS

The concrete basin located beneath the product storage tanks still contains DOOI waste (as classified by Wastex). No Subpart F ground water monitoring program has been proposed or implemented. The area continues to be "used for the retention of any leaks or spills of hazardous waste" as stated in the August 26, 1983 letter from James Markle to Ken Mensing.

The integrity of the basin has not been checked since Wastex #2 started operating, although wastes have been accumulating there since before Wastex #2 took over, per Mr. Burroughs. It is not known if the basin leaks because no inspections of the sides or the bottom have been conducted.

It should be noted that Mr. Markle was notified in an August 10, 1983 CIL and again in an October 4, 1983 CIL that his "area located beneath the product storage tanks" meets the definition of a surface impoundment and is regulated under Subpart F: Ground Water Monitoring and Subpart K: Surface Impoundments.

Alvin Markle informed us that a contractor had been hired to remove material from the impoundment so that it could be cleaned out. Perry Mann informed him that he should close it out following Subpart K closure requirements.

#### MRD/cas

cc: Mark Haney
cc: Southern Region
cc: Bob Kuykendall
cc: Phil Van Ness

#### APPENDIX A-1

# FACILITY INSPECTION FORM FOR COMPLIANCE WITH INTERIM STATUS STANDARDS COVERING GROUND-WATER MONITORING

Con	pany	Name: Wostex Research #2, Inc:	IEPA I.D. Number: 1PC 16304538
Com	pany	Address: 2000 Broadway Ave.:	USEPA I.D. Number: <u>TLD980700744</u>
		Fast St. Louis	Inspector's Name: Margo Dilday
		IL 62205	- Ferry Mann
Com	pany	Contact/Official: James Morkle;	Branch/Organization:
Tit	1e:_	President:	Date of Inspection: July 12, 1984
			Yes No Unknown Wavied
Тур	e of	facility: (check appropriately)	
	a) b) c) d)	surface impoundment landfill land treatment facility disposal waste pile*	
Grou	ind-l	later Monitoring Program	•
١.	revi	the ground-water monitoring program lewed prior to site visit? "No,"	<
	a)	Was the ground-water program reviewed at the facility prior to site inspection?	✓ _ no documented progr
	(cap impa the	a ground-water monitoring program able of determining the facility's ct on the quality of groundwater in uppermost aquifer underlying the lity) been implemented? 725.190(a)	

\*Listed separate from landfill for convenience of identification.

Completed checklist consists of Appendix A-1.

PUL 24100-JUL 24100-E.P.A. - D.L.P.C.

	•	Yes No	<u>Unknown</u> <u>Wavied</u>
<b>/</b> 3.	Has at least one monitoring well been installed in the uppermost aquifer hydraulically upgradient from the limit of the waste management area? 725.191(a)(1)		
	a) Are ground-water samples from the uppermost aquifer, representative of background ground-water quality and not affected by the facility (as ensured by proper well number, locations and depths?)	_N/A_	
4.	Have at least three monitoring wells been installed hydraulically downgradient at the limit of the waste handling or management area? 725.191(a)(2)	<i>\sigma</i>	. ·
	a) Do well numbers, locations and depths ensure prompt detection of any statistically significant amounts of hazardous waste or hazardous waste constituents that migrate from the waste management area to the uppermost aquifer?	_N/A_	`
5.	Have the locations of the waste management areas been verified to conform with information in the ground-water program?	_N/-A_	no ground-water
	a) If the facility contains multiple waste management components, is each component adequately monitored?	\(	, 3
6.	Do the numbers, locations, and depths of the ground-water monitoring wells agree with the data in the ground-water monitoring system program?  If "No," explain discrepancies.	_A\ U_	
7.	Well completion details. 725.191(c)		
	<ul> <li>a) Are wells properly cased?</li> <li>b) Are wells screened (perforated)</li> <li>and packed where necessary to enable</li> </ul>	_A/A_	
	sampling at appropriate depths? c) Are annular spaces properly sealed	_A\ <i>K</i>	-
	to prevent contamination of ground- water?	_A\U_	

								103	110	OHKHOWH	MATTEU
	8.				mpling a 725.192		sis				
		b) Is c) Do	the p	plan in	at the clude pr				/A		
		1) 2) 3) 4) 5)	Samj Samj Samj Ana	ple ships lytical p	ection? ervation	es?			1/A		
	9∤	water sa	amples first	being to	neters fi ested qua 725.192(b	arterly	-		_	no san	iple: to
					ater samp followin					ph fac	< +iiii
-		1)	suit as a	ability	haracter of the g g water	round-wa		N	/A		
		2) 3)	Para wate	meters e r qualit	stablish y? 725. sed as i	19Ž(Ď)(2	?)	_N/	'A		
		•	grou		contami			N/	/A		
			(i) (ii)	are at measure upgrad sample first y 725.192 Are proculate arithme of the concent	ch indic least for ements of ient well obtained year of r 2(c)(2) ovisions the initial etic mean respections ed from t	our replotained of the formal control of the	icate at each ch the ng? cal- kground riance neter	\/	/ <u>A</u>		
				well(s)	during 725.192(	the firs		N/	'A		

•	<b>:</b>	Yes	No	Unknown	Wavied
b)	For facilities which have completed first year ground-water sampling and	N/A;	tenit	year of	sampl
	analysis requirements:	not co	simpl	eted as	requir
	<ol> <li>Have samples been obtained and analyzed for the ground-water quality parameters at least</li> </ol>		·		v
	<ul> <li>annually? 725.192(d)(1)</li> <li>Have samples been obtained and analyzed for the indicators of ground-water contamination at</li> </ul>	***************************************			
	least semi-annually? 725.192(d)(2)				
c)	determined at each monitoring well each				
d)	time a sample was taken? 725.192(e) If it was determined that modification of the number, location or depth of monitoring wells was necessary, was				-
	the system brought into compliance with 725.191(a)? 725.193				
ass	s an outline of a ground-water quality sessment program been prepared? s.193(a)		∠.		÷
a)	Does it describe a program capable of determining:				
	1) Whether hazardous waste or hazardous waste constituents have entered the				
	<ul><li>ground-water?</li><li>The rate and extent of migration of</li></ul>	_N/	Δ		
	hazardous waste or hazardous waste constituents in ground-water? 3) Concentrations of hazardous waste	_N//	<u></u>		
	or hazardous waste constituents in ground-water?	_N //	<u>A</u>		
ь)	Were records kept of the analyses and evaluations, specified in the ground-water quality assessment (throughout				
	the active life of the facility)? 725.194(b)(1)	_N/6	<u>A_</u>		
	If a disposal facility, were(are) records kept through the post-closure period as well?	_K / I	Δ		
•	•		-7		

10.

•	Tes No Unknown Wavied
11. Have records been kept of analyses for parameters in 725.192(c) and (d)? 725.194(a)(1)	no analyses
12. Have records been kept of ground-water surface elevations taken at the time of sampling for each well? 725.194(a)(1)	N/A no wells, no same
13. Have records been kept of required how elevations in 725.192(e)? 725.194(a)(1)	No evaluations

\*EPA will be proposing (Spring 1982) to replace this reporting requirement with an exception reporting system where reports will be submitted only where maximum contaminant levels or significant changes in the contamination indicators or other parameters are observed. EPA has delayed compliance stage for 14 a) above until August 1, 1982 (Federal Register, February 23, 1982, p. 7841-7842) to be coupled with exception reporting in the interim.

evaluations elevations in 725.192(e)? 725.194(a)(1)